APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,166	07/28/2003	Terry M. Martin	200208612-1	5598

22879   7590   04/01/2009
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
DAILEY, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2452	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,9,13,15,25,26,28-30 and 35-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,9,13,15,25,26,28-30 and 35-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

    forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since

    this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the

    fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous

    Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

    submission filed on January 21, 2009 has been entered.

2. Claims 35-39 were added by the amendment filed on January 21, 2009.

3. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16-24, 27, and 21-34 have been cancelled as of the

    filed amendment.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 13, 15, 25, 26, 28-30 and 35-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed January 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they

    are not persuasive.

6. The applicant argues with respect to claims 1 and 25 that Karakashian (US Pub.

    No. 2004/0064503) and Felciano (US Pat. 6,052,730) fail to disclose a message

    handler associated with a client intercepting a message intended for a network

    service, interjecting a session identifier into the message, or storing the time at

    which the message was transmitted to the network service.

7. The examiner disagrees. Karakashian discloses:

   a message handler associated with a client intercepting a request from the

client intended for a network service ([0036], protocol adapter ("message

handler") identifies and routes ("intercepts") requests to web services);

   interjecting a session identifier into the request ([0036], lines 11-12, protocol

adapter propagates message context, with requests, to web services; message

contexts include identifying data as disclosed in [0038])

   Additionally, Felciano discloses a message handler storing the time at which

a request was transmitted to a network service (column 4, lines 51-65, various

information about client requests, including data and time stamps, are logged by

lamprey program in a database). The combination and a more detailed rejection

of claims 1 and 25 are outlined below.

8. The applicant further argues with respect to claim 36 that Karakashian and

   Felciano fail to disclose a message handler associated with a network service

   that comprises logic configured to identify a session identifier within an

   intercepted request and store in a database relative to the session identifier the

   time at which the request was received.

9. The examiner disagrees. Karakashian discloses a message handler associated

   with a network service that comprises logic configured to identify a session

   identifier within an intercepted request ([0036], session identifiers are essential in

the request in order for the protocol adapter ("message handler") to "identif[y]

requests as web service messages, as well as routing the messages to a web

services container").

Additionally, Felciano discloses a message handler associated with a network

service that comprises logic configured to identify a session identifier within an

intercepted request and store in a database relative to the session identifier the

time at which the request was received column 4, lines 51-67, lamprey program

("message handler") logs information related to requests in order to track

"individual web sessions," with session identifiers being essential to such a task).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 13, 15, 25, 26, 28-30 and 35-39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karakashian et al (US Pub. No.

2004/0064503), hereafter "Karakashian," in view of Felciano et al (US Pat.

6,052,730), hereafter "Felciano."

12. As to claim 1, Karakashian discloses a method, the method comprising:

a client sending intended for a network service ([0032], lines 4-7, web

services client invokes (requests) a web service);

a message handler associated with the client intercepting the request ([0032],

lines 4-7, A protocol adapter intercepts the invoke (request));

interjecting a session identifier into the request ([0036], lines 11-12, protocol

adapter propagates message context, with requests, to web services; message

contexts include identifying data as disclosed in [0038])

the message handler storing information about the request ([0038], invocation

context (information about the request) is stored);

the message handler intercepting a response to the request from the network

service and intended for the client ([0036], lines 3-6, protocol adapter also

handles response data);

the message handler identifying the session identifier within the response

([0036], lines 3-6, a session identifier is essential in the response in order for the

protocol adapter ("message handler") to "return the data to the originator of the

request");

the message handler providing the response to the client ([0036], lines 3-6,).

But, Karakashian does not explicitly disclose a message handler storing the

time at which a request was transmitted to a network service (column 4, lines 51-

65, various information about client requests, including data and time stamps, are

logged by lamprey program in a database) or storing in the database relative to the session identifier the time at which the response was received.

However, Felciano discloses a message handler storing, in a database relative to a session identifier, the times at which network messages were transmitted (column 4, lines 51-65, various information about client requests, including data and time stamps, are logged by lamprey program in a database; as the lamprey program ("message handler") logs information in order to track "individual web sessions," session identifiers are essential to such a task).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Karakashian and Felciano to more effectively monitor client and web services interactions which, for example, would allow web site designers to analyze how to improve the design of web sites and increase ease of use (Felciano, column 5, lines 1-14).

13. As to claims 25 and 29, it is rejected by a similar rationale set forth in claim 1's rejection.

14. As to claim 36, Karakashian discloses a computer-readable medium that stores a message handler associated with a network service, the message handler comprising:

logic configured to intercept a request sent to the network service from a

client ([0032], lines 4-7, A protocol adapter intercepts the invoke (request));

logic configured to identify a session identifier within the request ([0036],

identification of a session identifiers are essential in the request in order for the

protocol adapter to "identif[y] requests as web service messages, as well as

rout[e] the messages to a web services container"); and

logic configured to provide the request to the network service ([0036]).

But, Karakashian does not explicitly disclose storing the time at which a

request was transmitted to a network service in a database relative to the

session identifier.

However, Felciano discloses storing the time at which a request was

transmitted to a network service in a database relative to the session identifier

(column 4, lines 51-65, various information about client requests, including data

and time stamps, are logged by lamprey program in a database; as the lamprey

program logs information in order to track "individual web sessions," session

identifiers are essential to such a task).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Karakashian and Felciano to

more effectively monitor client and web services interactions which, for example,

would allow web site designers to analyze how to improve the design of web sites and increase ease of use (Felciano, column 5, lines 1-14).

15. As to claim 2, Karakashian and Felciano disclose intercepting the request comprises the message handler intercepting a request sent by a network service acting in the capacity of a client (Karakashian, [0032], lines 4-7, web services client invokes (calls) a web service)).

16. As to claims 5, 15, 26, 37, and 39 Karakashian and Felciano disclose message handlers storing in the database relative to the session identifier at least one of a name of the client, a name of a network service, a message type, and substance of the request. (Felciano, column 4, lines 51-65; Karakashian disclose multiple message handlers (protocol adapters), see Fig. 1).

17. As to claims 9 and 28, Karakashian and Felciano disclose interjecting at least one of a message type (Karakashian, [0038]).

18. As to claim 13, Karakashian discloses multiple message handlers (Fig. 1, i.e. "protocol adapters") and see the rejection of claim 1 for the functionality of the protocol adapters with respect to the claimed message handler.

19. As to claim 30, Karakashian and Felciano disclose the message handler is a

simple object access protocol (SOAP) message handler (Karakashian, [0025]).

20. As to claim 38, it is rejected by a similar rationale to that of claim 1's rejection.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is

571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday;

9:00am - 5:00pm.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. J. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452